1882-
(Mugroi) File No. 2 of 1882

B.

Petition of Alasingrish praying
for the Cancellation of his Suspension
of Pujaridhik of Anjaneya temple

Endorsed

Seal No 2456

3.57

To

Hur C. Runga Charloo Esqre C. I. E.

2nd 1887 Dewan Sait to His Highness

The Maha Raja of Mysore

Bangalore

The humble petition of
Singriah, Lutchmi
Singiah & Singriah Pooj
of Davoora Hoshally Anja-
neiah's Temple of Chau
Hobbly Coviepet Talook.

Most respectfully sheweth—

That the petitioners beg to state that one Kristamiah (our cousin) complained ag Anllasingariah one of the petitioners stating that he has committed a theft of Chunder belonging to the said Temple, on receipt the Complaint the Amil reported the to the Superintendent of the late Barg Division vide Derzi No. 267 of 3rd April/57 one which report the Superintendent an order No. 1588 of 7th April/57 stating "until fur Her orders Anllasingriah "be placed under suspension and "Analiah mentioned in your Derzi be "nominated instead of Anll

to.

[illegible] Mudaliyar to [illegible] Arachchi [illegible] dated [illegible] enclosing [illegible] Aullavisingrale [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

appeald against this decision and the
Assistant Commissioner reversed the
decision of the Amil vide his appeal suit
No 90 of 1869-70.

We appeald against this decision
to the Superintendent of the Nundidroog
Division, who in appeal suit No 500 of 1869/70
Confirmed the opinion of the Assistant
Commissioner.

Against this we submitted a petition
to the Chief Commissioner who in his
No 3990 dated 2nd November 70 to the address
of the 203 Superintendent Nundidroog Divisi
Says "That it seems to me that the de ' ' '
"passed in this case have not been well"
"Considered &c" and in the conclusion
he says "That the petitioners have been in-
"formed that the Chief Commissioner"
"declines to interfere in the case"

That owing to some inconvenience
and loss of Member in the family we
obliged to shut ourselves from the hardship

Now we beg to approach your honor
as the highest seat of justice & mercy
and humbly beg to submit the following
reasons with a greatest belief that your
honor will not fail to protect them in
justice, on due perusal of the reasons.

---

1. That as the complainant Kristaniah fai
to establish or to prove his false allegation
of theft, to the report called for or the fu
instructions alluded to in order No 452
is received or issued

When

2— That Complaint failed Aulladdi=
=yiah prayed for his reinstatement but
neither any Notice paid nor his Pen=
=sion restored.———————

3— That the decree of the Talook Court
in Regd suit No 389 of 1864, is just and
Equitable one.———————

4.— That the decision of both the Appellate
Courts are wrong in Law and contrary
to the existing records or to the weigth
of evidences as they have been guided
by wrong principals or references.

5.— That the opinion of Col Meade (then
the Chief Commissioner) in the Com=
=mencement of the letter above alluded
is good & just but the conclusion is bad
and unjust as his declension to interfer
into the case (gave no credit to his first
opinion) shows that he has confirmed
the decision of the Lower Courts, whose
decision he first blamed.———————

6— That it is general rule of the Poojaries
(Petitioners & others) to keep in or possess the
Armaments &c that have been received
in their turn duty and to make use of
them (to the Temple God) again at their
turn, while so keeping in the things &c in
their possession cannot be, reckoned
as a "theft".———————

7 That the contents of the circular
dated 3rd May 1869, is as follows.———

"If a Shanbogue or a Patail be punished" ... No 543 / 57
"with imprisonment under Criminal"
"breach of trust, or any other heinous"
"offences their or his relatives are debarred"
"from their hereditory places or Stocks."—

As the duty of Shanboge or Patail is quite different from the Poojaree's place besides this the charge of theft compl against the petitioner Bullasingiah is either proved or any punishment awarded while so that the circular order dated 3rd May 1869, relied upon by the assistant Commissioner in his appeal suit No 9 of 1869-70 confirmed by the superintendent of the Chudirooy Division in appeal suit No 500 of 1869-70 is wrong and cannot be made applic in this case.

8.— That the order No 158 of 7th April/71 which conveys Bullasingiahs dismissal runs thus "That the appointment of Veroomaliah is term "one at the time". subsequent to it in order no further instructions or orders were issued by the superintendent of the division as stated in order No 452, regarding the dismissal of Bullasingiah or for the confirmation of Veroomaliah. This shows that the matter is still pending unsettled.

9.— Supposing if your honor were to take said circular as a matter of reference in our case (no punishment of whatever nature to any of your honor's petitioners) we beg to draw your honor's attention to the proceedings of your honor dated 5th March 1881 No 927 34/17 which strengthens the petitioners claim for restoration.

10— That Veroomaliah enjoys or performs the duty in lieu of Bullasingiah as an

order
an officiating under Rc 158 of 1851
but not under the free will & consent
of the Petitioners or as their partner.-
11 That the chief Judge of Mysore -
Lately ruled in one of the second appeal
(about 2 or 3 months ago) that the long -
possession under dependancy cannot
be reckoned towards possession. ——
12. Under these reasons Veerooma
=liah's long enjoyment has observed
by the Asst Comr, Commissioner Mun
=diroog division, and the Chief Com=
=missioner Col Meade / cannot to be
Considered as he is only officiating
the Poojary's duty under the orders of
the Government pending the result
of the Complaint of Krishtamah, but
not as incumbent. ——————

In conclusion we most respect
=fully & humbly beg your honor to be so
generous as to have mercy on our
poverty and please peruse all the
records of the case and protect us by
means of (cancelling the suspension
of Nullasingriah) issuing an order
to the address of the Deputy Commissioner
of Bangalore, directing him to place
us in our respective duty of Poojarship
and thus relieve us from all the
hardships &c. ——————

We have none to protect us with:

Justice

Justice except your honour in
we have got greatest Confidence
of success & protection.

For which act of charity and
kindness we are in duty bound
shall ever pray for your honor's
long life & prosperity

We beg to remain
Most Respected Sir
Your Most obedient and
humble Servants

Bangalore
6/11/82

By Lutchmiumasiah
Sanjeeva
Sanjeeva

Care of Coonigul Venkatasoo-
-biahs Chicka
Petta
Bangalore

2-45-6
5-1

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]